DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 513 CS 502 786

AUTHOR Anapol, Malthon M., Ed.
TITLE Theme Issue on Classroom Communication.
INSTITUTION Metropolitan Washington Communication Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 46p.
JOURNAL CIT The Encoder; v6 n3 Spr 1979

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; Elementary Secondary Education; *Exercise (Physiology); *Parent Influence; Progressive Relaxation; Socialization; *Speech Communication; *Student Evaluation; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The first article in this journal issue offers a diffuse definition of instructional communication, the theme of the issue, and reviews literature that points out the ill-defined parameters of communication and the classroom. The following articles discuss the development of a rhetorical perspective on teaching, the parental role in facilitating language behavior and its implications for classroom communication, student evaluation of a public speaking course and the course instructor, combatting stress and tension through the use of relaxation exercises in the speech communication classroom, and language socialization in the classroom. (AEA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED181513

THE ENCODER

Journal of the Metropolitan Washington Communication Association

Volume 6 **Spring 1979** **Number 3**

Theme Issue on Classroom Communication

Editor, Malthon M. Anapol, Howard University

Associate Editors: Mohammad Jahed and William Starosta
Howard University

The Encoder **is published by the Metropolitan Washington Communication Association three times during the academic year; Fall, Winter, and Spring. Each issue will feature a theme, but articles not related to the theme of the issue may be included. The current issue is devoted to Classroom Communication. The themes and deadlines for Volume 7 are: Fall Issue, Communication and Children (deadline December 30, 1979) Winter Issue, Rhetoric and Forensics (deadline January 25, 1980) and Spring Issue, Communication and the Future (deadline March 20, 1980.) Articles not related to the themes may be submitted at any time. All articles submitted are reviewed by the editors and the consulting editors. Please enclose a stamped, self addressed envelope if you wish manuscripts returned.**

The Encoder **will consider articles utilizing either the MLA Style Sheet (second edition) or the APA Publication Manual (second edition.) We request only that authors be consistent in their use of either system. We prefer articles of 2,000 words or less, but we will give consideration to longer articles. Contributions may deal with any aspect of communication and utilize any method or methods of research. We also invite news and personal items for our *Potomac Patter* section. The title and cover design is the work of Dr. Jerry Hendrix of American University.**

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Metropolitan Washington Communication Assoc.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS502786

THE ENCODER

Journal of the Metropolitan Washington Communication Association

Volume 6 | Spring 1979 | Number 3

Theme Issue on Communication and the Classroom

TABLE OF CONTENTS

An Introduction to Classroom Communication
Joseph L. McCaleb, Consulting Editor..... 3

Rhetorical Perspective on Teaching
Steven C. Rhodes..... 5

Parental Facilitating Language Behavior and Its Implications for Classroom Communication
Richard Wright..... 11

Perceived Equity and Student Evaluation of a Public Spraking Course and Instructor
Daniel I. Munger and N.L. Reinsch,Jr..... 23

Combatting Stress and Tension Through the Use of Relaxation Exercises in the Speech Communication Classroom
Teresea G. Elliott and George S. Everly,Jr..... 33

Language Socialization in the Classroom
David R. Woods and Richard Wright..... 39

AN INTRODUCTION TO CLASSROOM COMMUNICATION

Joseph L. McCaleb

University of Maryland

Classroom communication is currently a term seeking definition. A review of textbooks used in teacher education courses on classroom communication shows that contents range from a slight modification of materials found in the typical introductory speech textbook to a dicussion of product-process research regarding teacher-student interaction (White, 1979, pp. pp. 16-21). The papers included in this issue of of the *Encoder* demonstrate the diversity of interpretation.

In order to judge the desirability of a diffuse definition, a basic question needs investigation: Are existing communication a sufficient heuristic for classroom communication? *Rhetorical Perspective on Teaching* explores the application of the most enduring model of communication to instruction. Although other perspectives are not represented in this issue, the reader might ask if classroom communication could be equally, if not more enlightened through an interpersonsal or an organizational perspective on communication. Are there existing models adequate, even in combination, or is there a need for a special model of communication to accurately explain what happens in the classroom?

Opinion within the communication profession seem to be somewhat at odds. Nyquist and Booth (1977) claim that instructional communication is a particular kind of communication with specisl purposes and distinguishing characteristics, and they by giving four special dimensions. On the other hand, Bassett and Smythe (1979) argue that;

Despite the unique characteristics we have identified, however, the process of communication is essentially the same in classroom groups as it in a variety of other organizations. It is artificial then, to talk of classroom communication as if it were a distinct form of communication. [p. 5]

Scott and Wheeless (1977) point out the *ill defined parameters* of instructional communicar communication but predict the focus to become even more diffuse. Although some people seem to make distinctions

between instructional communicar communication and classroom communication, until parameters for the terms are more clearly established the two appear to be cousins and share the problem of definition.

While awaiting a better articulated statement of the boundries of classroom communication, it seems appropriate to work from a general question: What communication theory and training is of distinctive importance to the classroom teacher? One significant area within this umbrella relates theory on language acquisition to the communication patterns in the classroom, especially with elementary school children. Two papers, *Language Socialization in the Classroom* and *Parental Facilitating Language Behavior*, explore implications of this relationship. *Perceived Equity and Student Evaluations* although less immediately apparent, concern significant influences upon and results of classroom communication.

Finally, many teachers continue to search for better methods of assisting students to develop communication skills. Just as Scott and Wheeless point out that instructional communication extends beyond but includes the traditional concerns of communication education, activities which improve the expressive and receptive abilities of students are vital to classroom communication.

This issue will not resolve the boundries of classroom communication. Perhaps it better illustrates the ambiguity of the term. More importantly, perhaps, it will stimulate the reader to become engaged with the basic questions that are introduced and to contribute to the dialogue between communication and education.

Bassett, R.E. and Smythe, M.J. *Communication and instruction*. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.

Nyquist, J.L. and Booth, J.L. *Instructional communication: A basic course for teachers. Communication Education*, 1977, 26.

Scott, M.D. and Wheeless, L.R. Instructional communication theory and research: An overview. In B.D. Ruben(Ed.) *Communication yearbook I*. New Brunswicj, N.J.: International Communication Association, 1977.

White, J.A. Clarify and student opportunity to learn: An investigation of two components of instructional communication as assessed by situational testing of pre-service teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, 1979.

RHETORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON TEACHING

Steven C. Rhodes

Western Michigan University

Since 1949, theorists have progressively characterized the act of teaching as a type of communication.1 Some theorists not only view teacher-student communication as one part of teaching, but assert that teaching *is* communication.2 While these theorists have correctly identified the place of communication in teaching, they have overlooked the rhetorical nature of teacher-student interaction. Theorists have not systematically examined the active nature of teaching, the persuasive characteristic of classroom communication, the necessity of discovering and implementing choices based on sensitivity to the constraints of the students and the classroom, and the importance of adapting methods of teaching to the requirements of a particular situation.

The purpose of this article is to develop a rhetorical perspective on teaching. From a rhetorical perspective, purposive teacher-student communicatio is viewed as a process of decision-making which involves discovering communicable ideas and selecting from those ideas which is to be communicated through consideration of the teacher's goals, the student's needs and the constraints offered by the situation.

classroom as a Rhetorical Situation

Normally, when we think of rhetoric, we are concerned with using communication in order to achieve our goals. In this light, rhetoric is seen as a method for generating and managing talk to achieve a goal in a particular situation. When a situation can be changed through communication it is referred to as a rhetorical situation.3

There are three necessary constituents of any rhetorical situation; exigence, audience, and constraints. Basically, an exigence, gives purpose to rhetoric because it is a want or need that can be modified through communication. A rhetorical audience is made up of those people capable of being influenced by the communication. Constraints

are of two kinds: those managed by the speaker (rhetor) and those managed by the situation.4

For the purpose of developing a teaching model based on the rhetorical approach, I find it helpful and necessary to expand the conceptual area which I said people normally think of when they talk about rhetoric and associated concepts. Such an expansion provides me with the opportunity to discuss teaching and learning in a way that seems reasonable and meaningful to me. For example, instead of limiting our definition of rhetoric to talk, let us expand it so rhetoric is seen as a method of creating change — a method of making something happen that is not happening now. Taking the concept of exigence — one way to expand it is to simply see it as *a need to bring about modified through rhetoric.*

In any classroom situation there exists patterns of wants and needs capable of being modified through oral discourse. These wants and needs may be overt or covert and exist within and among all of the people involved. For any teacher to be successful he or she must be sensitive to his or her own wants and needs, the wants and needs of the students, know and understand classroom situation, be familiar with all teaching resources available within the situation, and be capable of applying and adapting the resources to each particular situation. Thus, a classroom presents the teacher with a rhetorical situation, and, a rhetorical approach to teaching involves the ability of the teacher to discover in any situation all of the available means of 'persuasion' and the ability to utilize those means within the classroom situation.

Theoretical Support

Phillips supports a rhetorical perspective on the teaching-learning process.6 He relates classical definitions of rhetoric to teaching and emphasizes the adaptive nature of rhetorical action. He states:

*[The Teacher] must be able to examine the 'given case' and find all the available means to apply to it. By 'available means;' we would refer to his competencies. His analysis would lead him to decisions about when and where to do what directed at whom for what purpose. Teaching would then not be a formulation but an activeprocess of mutual adaptation, in which teacher and students could exchange services, each designed to aid the other in accomplishing his rhetorical goals.*7

Roderick Hart and Don Burks supplement their orientation by illustrating the considerations a person must make to be sensitive to the

workings of the rhetorical process. They claim that the rhetorically sensitive person will sharethe following five realizations about human interaction:

1. Because social interactants are multi-faceted, the rhetorically sensitive person tries to accept role-taking as part of the human condition.
2. Because the outcomes of social interactions are unpredictable, the rhetorically sensitive person attempts to avoid stylized verbal behavior.
3. Because social interactions bring different people together in an atmosphere of flux, the rhetorically sensitive person is characteristically willing to undergo the strain of adaptation.
4. Because the other is a primary constraint of communicative thinking, the rhetorically sensitive person seeks to distinguish between all information and information acceptable for communication.
5. Because ideas themselves do not prescribe forms of verbalization, the rhetorically sensitive person tries to understand that an idea can be rendered in multi-form ways. 8

From these theoretical statements it is evident that to assume a rhetorical perspective on teacher-student interaction necessitates the acceptance of three propositions. These propositions are:

1. Teacher's rhetorical behavior may be viewed as the result of a decision makingprocess.
2. Teacher's rhetorical decisions on what is to be said are based on the teacher's analysis of the potential effects of his or her messages on the students.
3. The effects of the teacher's rhetorical messages rest in the her rhetorical message to determine if it has the desired effect. This process is necessary since the effects of the message are ultimately determined by the student's interpretations of the messages.

Given these propositions, the teacher must be able to analyze the students in particular situations in order to act rhetorically. From the analysis of audience and situation, the teacher needs to be able to generate sayables which are adapted to the occasion and the audience. And, after acting rhetorically, the teacher must monitor the effects of his or her rhetorical message to determine if it had the desired effect. This process is necessary since the effects of the message are ultimately determined by the student's interpretations of the message.

Rhetorical Responsibilities

When teachers identify learning objectives they identified chages they would like to see take place in their students — they see a need to bring about chage — they see a readiness for chage. In short, learning objectives identify a need for change. The classroom situation as a whole brings into force constraints (opportunities and limitations) within which and through which teachers must work to evoke change — to meet their objectives. In addition, teachers must be able to analyze the wants and needs of their students, assess the opportunities and limitations set forth in each educational and classroom situation, be aware of their own interests and resources as teachers, and know each curriculum's educational objectives. All for the purpose of being able to discover the best pedagogical strategies or options available for meeting the exigences of the learners, the situation, the educational system, and themselves. More specifically, a classroom teacher has the following rhetorical responsibilities:

1. To discover the needs and wants of the student audience;
2. To decide in what ways the student is to be changed as a result of the learning experience;
3. To determine what methods are available and which can be utilized to bring about the desired changes;
4. To adapt the methods and classroom materials to the wants and needs of the student audience; and
5. To solicit, analyze, and utilize student feedback to determine the effectiveness of the teaching strategy.

Thus, teachers who look upon their classrooms as rhetorical situations will be continually involved in systematic analysis and decision-making processes. By analyzing the situation, a teacher should be able to identify and clarify exigences (learning objectives). Then, based on the analysis a teacher must decide what pedagogical strategies are best suited for meeting the exigences. The more knowledgeable a teacher is of his or her students' wants, needs and capabilities; the more skillful a teacher is at clarifying learning objectives; and the more resourceful a teacher is at selecting pedagogical options, the more rhetorically effective that teacher will be.

Conclusion

More complete explanations of the rhetorical perspective can be found should the reader wish to pursue the concept further.9 However, I

should conclude my appliction of the perspective to a teaching model by stating that learning to operate from arhetorical perspective is difficult. Aristotle defined as an art; and as such it is no less difficult than learning any other art form. It takes time, patience, perceptiveness and abilities. I am not sure everyone can master this approach. Bit I feel that anyone who attempts to teach should possess the qualities of the rhetor-communicator. As Phillips states: 'The net effect of educating the teacher to take a role as rhetorician is to equip him for his task as well as anyone can be equipped.'10 This aproach invests the teacher with the right and ability to consider his or her competencies and design appropriate goals and construct strategies, particular to the need of the specific situation, to meet those goals. This process accounts for the dynamic energetic process that communication and teaching is ad provides a model of teaching that truly is process oriented toward realistic goals. Lastly, the rhetorical process is bounded by the limitations of what real humanscan achieve in human situations. Rhetoric is not without a moral — but the moral is Aristotelian in the best sense — given what we have, the constraints we must work under, what is the best we can achieve?

Teachers ae realists. They understand that they are unable to be all things to all people. We live in a world with many realistic limitations. It demands that we be intelligent about our goals, perceptive about our analysis of situations, competent in our skills of application and lastly, realistic about what is humanly possible to achieve in any given case. A rhetorical approach to teaching continues to be a realistic approach,and for me, the most sensible. It is an approach that allows one to deal with the uncertainty of the human condition.

FOOTNOTES

1. Several notable examples are: N.L. Gage,' Theories of Teaching,' *Teaching: Essays and Readings*, ed. Kaoru Yamanoto, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969) p. 338; Kaoru Yamanoto, 'Analysis of Teaching-Another Look,' *Teaching: Essays ad Readings*, p. 355; John Withall, 'The Development of a Technique for the Measurement of Social-Emotional Climate in Classrooms,' *Journal of Experimental Education*, 17 (1949) pp. 347-361; Ned A. Flanders, *Interaction Analysis in the Classroom: A Manual for Observers* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota 1960)

2. Ronald T. Hyman,*Teaching: Vantage Points for Study* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1968) pp. 13-14.

3. Lloyd F. Bitzer, 'The Rhetorical Situation,' *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 1 (January 1968)pp.1-14

4. Bitzer, p5.

5. Arthur Atwell, An Outline of Educaticnal Psychology (Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing, 1973), p. 131.

6. Gerald M. Phillips, 'Role Theory: Its Logical Conclusion,' *Teacher Education as Actor Training*, Occasional Papers of the Society of Professors of Education, ed. A. Bagley, No. 3 (Minneapolis, 1974), pp. 63-72.

7. Phillips, p. 68.

8. Roederick P. Hart and Don M. Burks, 'Rhetorical Sensitivity and Social Interaction,' *Speech Monographs*, 39 (June 1972) pp. 75-91.

9. For a more in-depth examination of the concept of rhetorical-communication, see, Gerald M. Phillips, David Butt, and Nancy Metzgar, *Communication in Eduction: A Rhetoric of Schooling and Learning* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 174) and James C. McCroskey, *An Introduction to Rhetorical Communication*, third edition, (New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1978).

10. Phillips, p. 71.

PARENTAL FACILITATING LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR CLASSROOM COMMUNICATION

Richard Wright, Ph.D.
Howard University

I. *Introduction*

One of the basic realities of observed parent-child communicative interaction is the fact that both parent and child enter jointly into an intersubjective language learning partnership in which the adult, through a diversified set of recurring interactive routines, provides for the child an optimal teaching or training language that facilitates the child's task of developing communicative verbal ability. Research interest in the social, interactive aspects of early language development is relatively recent and, as a result, few studies are available in the literature which address this process directly. Lack of research interest in interactive processes in language learning (by the child) as well as facilitative behaviors (by the adult) is attributable, in part, to general acceptance of unsupported and often blatantly incorrect assertions by nativists (e.g. Chomsky and Miller, 1963; Chomsky, 1965) who have claimed that speech addressed to children tends to be chaotic and too degenerate in quality for language learning. As is often the case in such absolute assertions, the claim of degenerate language input for the child was made prior to any relevant empirical investigation. The record has now been straightened out through the recent publication of parent-child interaction research (e.g. Snow, 1975; Newport, 1975; Thew, 1975; Bruner, 1975, 1978; Cross, 1977; McLean & McLean, 1978) which clearly demonstrates that parents (especially mothers) carefully and methodically adapt their speech to the communicative and cognitive level(s) or needs of their children. 1

A basic question suggested by this latter statement--the answer to which has direct implications for classroom communication in the early grades--is the following: To what extent does parental adaptation of verbal interaction to the child's communicative and cognitive needs contribute to the development of communicative skill in language? From a pedagogical perspective, one would want to know if

"motherese" is a teaching, therefore, facilitating language and if so, what specific kinds of verbal, interactive practices and routines have shown to be most effective in this natural language and learning process?

A fundamental problem must be recognized in the research published to date, namely, that the bulk of parent-child studies showing positive and facilitating communicative routines has focused on subjects of solidly middle-class, mainstream background and orientation. It is a matter of record both nationally and internationally that those children in classrooms experiencing the greatest communication inadequacies tend to be of lower-middle and lower-class socioeconomic background. Although the research literature is imbalanced as regards social class, the present writer adopts the position that the facilitating language behaviors identified among middle-class parent-child interactions are sufficiently rich in quality and easily reproducible in style as to justify their adoption in settings (such as the typical, everyday American classroom) where (1) young children interact with adults in a structured learning situation, and (2) there is a premium on expanding the communicative abilities of young children.

II. *Features of Adult-Child Verbal Interaction*

This section of the paper highlights some of the observed interactional features of parent-child communicative routines. The pivotal argument of the discussion which follows is that language is not presented to the child in a haphazard or random manner; instead, the child experiences a highly ordered and carefully arranged interaction with the caregiving adult, who selectively structures and facilitates the linguistic encounters of the child. This deliberate adaptation in mother-child communicative interaction has been referred to as "fine tuning," a label designed to capture the transactional quality of the partnership involved (see Bruner, 1978).

A. *General Interactional Features*

A number of authors have identified and described a range of overall features in adult speech to children. Newport (1976:3), for example, provides the following set of observed interactional features: Mothers employ a higher and more variable pitch; they speak more slowly with marked pauses after successive sentences; there are few hesitations and dysfluencies; the choice of vocabulary in addressing children tends to be highly restricted and concrete in reference; sentences tend to be short and well formed. Snow (1975:2-3) in an earlier study gives a similar description: Parental speech is slower, with a higher pitch, and easily recognizable because of its characteristically exaggerated intonation contour; sentences are shorter in length, with a low type-token ratio, and mainly concrete in vocabulary; speech is highly repetitious

and mothers often paraphrase if the child evidences difficulty in understanding the message on the first try.

McNamara (1972) and Snow (1975, 1976) emphasize the context dependency or immediate relevance of parental speech to children. In particular, they make note of the fact that much parent-child verbal interaction functions as a dialogue or conversation about objects, people, events, actions, relationships, etc. in the socio-physical world of experience. Such conversations with the child allow the parents to translate environmental variables (such as those itemized above) into the language code for the language learning child. This framing of utterances to the child on the basis of a meaning-filled nonverbal background facilitates the child's task of comprehending unknown or difficult words and structures in parental speech. That is, through the *here and now* of parent-child communicative behavior, the child has direct access to relevant contextual information in the immediate situation that is both redundant and highly salient for the child. Only later, when the child has acquired a high level of sophistication and fluency in language structure and use, does the parent employ the distancing function of language (Sigel, 1971).

In this brief discussion of the general features of adult-child verbal interaction, only a few of the total features cited in the literature have been identified. Also, since this dimension of language acquisition research is of recent origin, many aspects of parental speech to children have yet to be recognized. In many respects it is difficult to assess the quality and value of findings reported in the research literature. That is, although individual studies might focus on one or a few paradigm parent-child communicative features, the reader is at a loss to evaluate the merit of studies such as Blount and Padgug (1976) which identified and rated no less than thirty-four features of parental speech. Staggering in the sheer number of features identified is a recent study by Van der Geest et al. (1973) which coded exactly one hundred twenty-nine features of parental speech to children!

Although there is much current debate as to whether "motherese" is a teaching or facilitating language, there is no question that adults, especially mothers, do adjust their communicative style to meet the cognitive, social, and liguistic needs of their children.2 The argument adopted in the present paper is that in order to appreciate the value of parental language to children, one must *not* focus on the absolute form of the language used, but whether the adaptive character of that language is suitably adjusted to the receiving system of the child or children in question. The available research indicates that depending upon *how* and *when* the parent adapts and adjusts communicative interaction to the transactional needs of the child, such language *can* and *does* have very positive effects upon both the rate and level of language development. Correspondingly, disregard for insensitivity to, or ignorance of linguistic development or communicative needs can have negative effects on the acquisition of communicative ability. 3

B. *Specific Verbal Interactional Features*

In the preceding section a number of general features of observed parent-child interactional, verbal routines or adaptations were identified. The present section isolates for special attention a set of specific communicative features which seem particularly conducive to the development of adaptive strategies for classroom communication in the early grades. It is hoped that the discussion which follows will contribute to an emerging theoreticaland research base in the development or expansion of effective classroom communication strategies with young children. It is neither claimed nor assumed that the specific communicative routines under discussion are currently lacking in actual classrooms. The goal of the present section is two-fold:

(1) to identify and discuss briefly parent-child facilitating routines which seem conducive to linguisitic and communicative development; and
(2) to argue in support of the need for communicative continuity from the *language-learning home* 4 to the *language-expanding classroom*.

1. *Optimal Linguistic Lead*

In arguing for the facilitating value of adult language behavior on the child's linguistic and communicative development, it was noted that the crucial issue is not the absolute form of the language addressed to the child, but whether this language is an optimal fit to the language and communicative level of the child at different stages of development. Brown and Fraser (1963) were the first to raise this question in their research into early child syntax, a phenomenon which they referred to as the problem of the "optimal linguistic lead." Soderburgh (1974), as did Brown and Fraser before him, observed in adult interaction with their children the pattern of parental use of sentence structures which were "one step ahead of the child" (p. 9).5 The author concluded that parents evidence in their verbal interactional style an intuitive awareness of the child's progressive levels of receptive and expressive ability, which results in parents carefully selecting and adjusting their sentence patterns so as to model for the child the next higher developmental level. Parents would not, and probably *could* not, adjust their speech in this way if there were not "in tune" (following Bruner, 1978:44) with the on-going language and communicative needs and abilities of their children.

The function or value of this optimal linguistic lead as input to the child's communicative development appears to be two-fold:

(1) it ensures, by the parents' taking the language and communicative development of the child as the *point of departure* in verbal interaction,

that what is said will be both understandable and contextually relevant (therefore, meaningful) to the child; and

(2) it elicits or promotes more advanced language and communicative skills in the child.

Concerning the latter, Frank and Seegmiller (1973), who developed a sentence complexity index for measuring the qualitative difference between the language of parents and children, reported that mothers produced language that was consistently two to three years of development in advance of their children (see note 5). It can be argued that this deliberate pacing both *directs* and *motivates* the child in an optimally facilitating manner to learn the structures of his language (i.e., the sentence-forming patterns) as well as the ability to use these structures for communication.

Pedagogically, it would be valuable to know the actual range of linguistic levels and communicative skills in a classroom. Although it is an attested fact that many teachers in the primary grades do *adapt* their language style to the needs of young children, there remain large numbers of teachers who prefer to *adopt* a generalized interactional and communicative mode in the cclassroom. 6 Consistent with the argument presented thus far, such a generalized communicative mode will be neither affective nor effective for large numbers of children whose developmental and communicative abilities are below (often far below) the language style produced by the teacher. This problem is of special concern in classrooms where information value (in the mathematical sense) as well as the demand of processing new information are very high. Recognized problems of limited attention span of many young children in classrooms may be related, in part, to recurring difficulties in processing and understanding language that is stylistically, communicatively, or structurally distant from the child's experience or abilities.

The hypothesized relationship between attention span and language style has some basis and support in recent research. For example, Mahoney (1975) has suggested that the aforementioned adjustments or modifications in parental speech conform to Hunt's (*Intelligence and Experience*, 1961) theory regarding the pivotal importance of a minimal discrepancy between the learner's present state of knowledge and the difficulty level of a stimulus input (in the present argument, this stimulus input would be the language addressed to the child). According to Hunt, if this discrepancy is either too great or too small, the result will be, respectively, either frustration or boredom. Hunt referred to this discrepancy as the "the problem of the match." The argument adopted in the present study contends that parents *intuitively* activate this principle (of minimum discrepancy) when they methodically provide language input that is slightly more complex in structure and meaning than that which the child produces and un-

derstands. The pedagogical implications of this problem relate as much to written material for young children as to verbal interaction.

2. *Rhythmic and Rhyming Patterns*

It is a commonplace of learning theory that whatever is attended to with interest is learned more quickly, more easily and is retained longer in memory. The delight that children experience in nursery rhymes has been described (e.g. Chukovsky, 1963) and documented with cross-cultural evidence (e.g. Opie and Opie, 1959). Children undergoing experimental testing using song frames compared with substitution in normal, spontaneous sentences demonstrated a "higher ability (with song frames) than was reflected in normal speech" (Carlson and Anisfield, 1969:569).

Children receive a great deal of rhythmic and rhyming language throughout the language-learning years. It is a matter of record that both parents and children delight in the words, verses, and rhythmic qualities of such language interaction. Fowler (1962:130) reported the case of a girl who learned to speak, read, and spell far in advance of the average age. The author attributed this achievement to the fact that the child's mother had used "an endless variety of songs, games, and stories" in her language interaction routines. Such precocious acquisition of language skills evidence the potential value of rhythmic, rhyming language interaction as a facilitating device with young children. Several facts are clear in this regard:

(1) rhythmic patterns in language attract and hold the attention of young children;
(2) the same features contribute to better storage and recall in older children (Moerk, 1977);
(3) rhythmic patterns contribute to the increased learning of vocabulary and sentence-formation skills (as evidenced by the attested successes of applied language-training programs such as DISTAR).

Although it is not know exactly how the child uses rhythmic patterns in the learning of language material, it is generally acknowledged that such patterns facilitate aspects of the language learning process. That rhythmic patterning contributes to vocabulary acquisition and skills in sentence formation is sufficient rationale to exploit its potential in the classroom.

3. *Paraphrase and Repitition*

Tangentially related to the matter of rhythm and rhyme in adult-child language interaction is the recognized tendency of adults to paraphrase

or repeat utterances addressed to young children. The practice of paraphrase or utterance repitition is mentioned in conjunction with rhythmic features because adults in their verbal encounters with young children usually modify the rhythm of the paraphrased or repeated utterances, as in the following personally observed adult-child encounter:

[Child is standing next to a bed of multi-colored roses, as adult approaches].

Adult	Child
"Do you see something?"	
"Do you?"	[Points]
"Huh?"	
"What is it?"	
"What is that thing?"	
"Is it a flower?"	
"Huh?"	
"A flower?"	"flower"
"Yes, it's a flower."	
"A pretty flower."	
"Lots of pretty flowers."	"pretty"
"Yes, pretty flowers."	"flower"
"See the flowers."	[Touches rose]
"See, she likes the flowers."	
"All the pretty flowers."	"pretty flowers"
"Yes, pretty flowers."	

The alternating rhythm that accompanies these utterances allows the speaker to highlight with special intonation patterns sentence elements of focused attention in the interaction. It can also be argued that by varying the sentence frame, the adult is unconsciously modeling for the child the recurring syntactic structures in which words and grammatical forms systematically occur. Notable in this regard are the last nine adult utterances which vary slightly the surrounding syntactic context of the focused and pivotal lexical item "flower." Such flexible, varying rhythmic and syntactic patterns function additionally to hold the attention of the child for longer periods of adult-directed language stimulation.

Pedagogical implications are self-evident and receive support in the recent research of McLean and McLean (1978:72) who report that the common tendency of adults to paraphrase and repeat utterances addressed to children is consonant with existing educational practice of providing multiple stimuli in slightly varying form and contexts for the purpose of promoting concept formation andlearning generalization. The co-occurrence of rhythmic and paraphrased utterances in adult-child verbal interaction is significant in that such language trains the child into *selective listening* which enhances "the child's own ability to attend selectively to simple, meaningful and comprehensible utterances" (Snow, 1972:564). Academic success as well as communicative effectiveness is highly dependent upon the child's ability to attend to the relevant aspects of the instructional situation. Strategies which promote the child's ability to attend in the learning environment will be highly valued by the teacher and equally valuable to the child.

III. *Conclusion*

The classroom at school, like the living room (bedroom, basement, backyard, etc. at home) is a setting in which adults and children interact in regular, highly routinized ways. In both settings language is the basic medium of interaction and communication. Language mediates all that is said, a great deal of what is communicated, and the essence of what is taught and learned. The quality and variety of language that parents use in the home result in the socialization of children into modes of interaction and language use (Bernstein, 1964; Bernstein and Henderson, 1969; Ryan, 1974). The transition from the home setting of natural, spontaneous language behavior to the school setting of programmed, structured language behavior is difficult for most children initially. The role of language in this initial discomfort on the part of the child has often been cited in the literature. The present brief paper seeks to draw attention to some of the communicative features of home-based adult speech to children which might be applicable to classroom communication strategies with young children during the early grades.

As a final note, emerging theory of child language development as well as the implications of research findings to classroom practices with young children is itself in its infancy. A major factor of decisive importance to educators and classroom strategists is that current language acquisition research is very much *child-centered* and *interaction-oriented*. That is, current research is directed toward studying and understanding the child; his cognitive, social, linguistic, and communicative development together with the previously unrecognized and unappreciated role of the caregiving adult in providing an optimal language model for the child. Although parents do not make a conscious effort to be optimally facilitating as language

providers, it seems that much of their spontaneous verbal routines with their children are in accordance with many aspects of current learning theory. Classroom communication practices can be enriched through the conscious and strategic integration of selected "parent-tested" and "child-proven" verbal interactions of a facilitating nature. Jerome Bruner (1975) captures the essence of the present argument in stating that the natural language teacher is "an interpreting adult who operates not so much as a corrector or reinforcer, but rather as a provider and idealizer of utterances while interacting with the child" (p. 17). The classroom seeks to expand from the base which the home has provided. As regards communication, the classroom would do well to know what that base is like.

Reference Notes

1. The assumption regarding the inadequate quality of language input to the child was needed as direct support for the basic nativist theory of language. This theory postulated the existence of an innate, neurologically specified Language Acquision Device (LAD) which, it was argued, operated as a hypothesis testing and learning mechanism independently of the actual quality of quantity of language made available to it. Therefore, consistent with this nativist position, it was irrelevant how the adult verbally interacted with the child. The child was argued to have been born genetically equipped with a functional LAD whose internal make-up and processing operations were programmed to transcend the limitations of actual language performance.
2. Without empirical testing of the respective arguments, the issue remains highly speculative and contentious. McCarthy (1954), Fodor (1966), and McNeill (1966) take the extreme position of claiming the potential retarding effects of specific aspects of parental speech to children. It should be noted, however, that these individuals were concerned more narrowly with features of parental "baby-talk style" which Snow et al. (1976:12) concluded from a review of numerous anthropological studies is "a special register for addressing young child (which) seems to be available in most societies." (See also Ferguson, 1964). The issue of baby talk, however, is not central to the concerns of the present paper, and therefore, does not constitute a challenge to the basic argument adopted by the author, namely, that parental language does function as a teaching and facilitating verbal interactional style with young children.
3. Communicative ability is intended here to capture the notion of skill in both the learning of the formal linguistic code as well as the pragmative use of that code in actual interactive verbal behavior.

Reference Bibliography

Bernstein, B. 1964. "Elaborated and restricted codes: their social origins and some consequences." *American Anthropologist* 66(2): 55-69.

Bernstein, B., and D. Henderson. 1969. "Social class differences in the relevance of language to socialization." *Sociology* 3: 1-20.

Blount, B., and E. Padgug. 1976. "Mother and father speech: distribution of parental speech features in English and Spanish." Paper presented at Stanford Child Language Research Forum Conference, April, Stanford, Calif

Brown, R., and C. Fraser. 1963. "The acquisition of syntax." In: C. Cofer and B. Musgrave (eds.), *Verbal Behavior and Learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill

Bruner, J. 1975. "The ontogenesis of speech acts." *Journal of Child Language* 2: 1-19

Bruner, J. 1978. "Learning the mother tongue." *Human Nature, September, 42-49.*

Carlson, P., and M. Anisfeld. 1969. "Some observations on the linguistic competence of a two-year child." Child Development. 40: 569-576.

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Chomsky, N., and G. Miller. "Introduction to the formal analysis of natural languages." In: R. Luce, R. Bush, and E. Galanter (eds.), *Handbook of Mathematical Psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Chukovsky, K. 1963. *From Two to Five*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cross, T. 1977. "Mother's speech adjustments: the contributions of selected child listener variables." In: C. Ferguson and C. Snow (eds.), *Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferguson, C. 1964. "Baby talk in six languages." *American Anthropologist* 66: 103-114.

Fodor, J. 1966. "How to learn to talk: some simple ways." In: F. Smith and G. Miller (eds.), *The Genesis of Language*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Fowler, W. 1962. "Cognitive learning in infancy and early childhood." *Psychological Bulletin*. 59: 116-152.

Hunt, J. 1961. *Intelligence and Experience*. New York: Ronald Press.

Mahoney, G. 1975. An ethological approach to delayed language acquisition" *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*. 80: 139-148.

McCarthy, D. 1954. "Language development in children." In: L. Carmichael(ed.), *Manual of Child Psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

McLean, J., and L. Snyder-McLean. 1978. *A Transactional Approach to Early Language Training*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

MacNamara, J. 1972. "Cognitive basis of language learning in infants." *Psychological Review*. 79: 1-13.

McNeill, D. 1966 "Developmental psycholinguistics." In: F. Smith and G. Miller (eds.), *The Genesis of Language*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Moerk, E. 1977. *Pragmatic amd Semantic Aspects of Early Language Development*. Baltimore: University park Press.

Newport, E. 1976. "Motherese: the speech of mothers to young children."In: N. Castellan, D. Pisoni, and G. Potts (eds.), *Cognitive Theory*.Vol. 2. Hilladale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Newport, E., L. Gleitman, and H. Gleitman. 1975. "A study of mothers' speech and child language development." *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development*. 10: 111-116.

Opie, I., and P. Opie. 1959. *The Lore and Language of SchoolchildrenLondon*: Oxford University Press.

Ryan, J. 1974. "Early language development: towards a communication analysis." In: M. Richards (ed.), *The Integration of the Child into a Social World*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Sigel, I. 1971. "Language of the disadvantaged: the distancing hypothesis" In: C. Lavatelli (ed.), *Language Training in Early Childhood Education.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Snow, C. 1972. "Mothers' speech to children learning language." *ChildDevelopment* 43: 549-565.

Snow, C. 1976. "The conversational context of language acquisition." Paperpresented at the NATO Conference on the Psychology of Language, June, Univ. of Stirling, Scotland.

Snow, C., A. Arlman-Rupp, Y. Hassing, J. Jobse, J. Joosten, and J. Vorster. 1976. "Mothers' speech in three social classes." *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 5: 1-20.

Soderburgh, R. 1974. *Barnets Sprackutveckling och dess konsekvenserfoer pedgogiken.* Institutionen foer Nordiska Spraok, University of Stockholm.

Thew, C. 1975. "Theories about linguistic input." Paper presented at theWestern Conference on Linguistics, October, Calgary.

Van der Geest, T., R. Gerstel, R. Appel, and B. Tervoort. 1973. *The Child's Communicative Competence: Language Capacity in Three Groups of Children from Three Different Social Classes.* The Hague: Mouton.

PERCEIVED EQUITY AND STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF A PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSE AND INSTRUCTOR

Daniel I. Munger, Ph.D.
Southwest Texas State University

N.L. Reinsch, Jr., Ph.D.
Oklahoma State University

Among the factors which influence a teacher's career is the collective student evaluation of his or her courses. There continues to be some disagreement concerning the value, use and dimensions of such evaluations. 1 But it does appear that student evaluations are here to stay. Consequently, there is a continuing interest in the derterminants of such evaluations. One intriguing possibility, recently suggested in the *Southern Speech Communication Journal* by Lyle Sussman, is perceived equity. Among the several issues raised by Sussman is the question of whether or not "students' perceptions of their teacher may be a function of the teacher's ability to foster equitable exchanges in the classroom." 2

Sussman defines inequity as perception by a *Person* that in comparison to an *Other* his *Outcome* in a given relationship is inappropriate to his *Input*. Outcome consists of all extrinsic and intrinsic rewards perceived as relevant by the Person. Input consists of all investments of energy or resources perceived as relevant. The *Other* may be another person (either actual or hypothetical) or the Person at another time or in another context.

According to Sussman, four types of inequity may exist. Type 1 occurs when Outcome is larger than expected in light of Input; Type 2, when Outcome is smaller than expected. Type 3 occurs when required Input is larger than expected in light of Outcome; Type 4, when required Input is smaller. Thus type 1 and type 4, reflect a "profit" by Person while types 2 and 3 reflect a "loss." Both "profit" and "loss" should be perceived as inequitable; the experiences of a "loss" should, however, be more unpleasant than the experience of a "profit."

These considerations can be applied to the classroom. A student provides Input in such forms as time, effort, and previous experience. He or she receives Outcome in such forms as knowledge, skills, and grades. The rate of return may be evaluated in comparison to other

students in the same class, other students in other classes, or oneself in previous or different classes. Such an appraisal may, for example, lead a student to decide that an exchange is inequitable because the grade received on an assignment is too low in light of the effort invested by the student. The preceding example would be categorized as Type 2 inequity. Obviously, all four types could occur. It is our assumption however that the experience of a "loss" or a "profit" is of much greater significance than the "type" of the inequity. Consequently we will not be concerned with Sussman's four types but only with two larger categories: " profit" and "loss".

A person who experiences an exchange as inequitable is, according to Sussman, likely to feel some inclination to adjust the exchange to more closely approximate equity. Inequity may be resolved by adjusting Inputs, securing an adjustment of Outcome, or by revising the comparison Other. If these methods fail, Person may react to the perceived inequity be revising his or her attitudes toward the relationship in question. A student experiencing inequity might, for example, increase or decrease effort (Input); or seek to negotiate an adjustment in his or her grade (Outcome); or alter the comparison Other (for example, from "self in Business classes" to "self in Science classes"). If appropriate adjustments cannot be made the student may alter his or her attitude toward the inequitable relationship.

It is the latter possibility which interests us. Near the end of an academic term a student's resources for resolving inequity are frequently limited. It is too late to adjust Input. Outcome may be largely determined (and cannot be directly affected anyway).The selection of an appropriate comparison Other may be complete. In such a case continued inequity should affect student attitudes. And course evaluations, to extent that they measure student attitudes, should reflect the effects of unresolved inequity.

Sussman suggests that a student may reduce inequity "by de-evaluating the source of the grades--namely the teacher."3 This comment, however, seems to relate only to situations where the student experiences "loss." Students may also experience a "profit" and we expect that this occurence would inflate evaluations. Adams and Rosembaum4 found that workers who could not adjust their wages and believed themselves over-paid tended to increase their efforts. If a student comes to the end of an academic term experiencing a profit he or she can do little to increase Input and is unlikely to request a reduction in Outcome; we expect, therefore, that he or she will "repay" the instructor by evaluating the instructor or course more highly than otherwise.

In this study we attempted to answer the following question: are instructor and course evaluations significantly related to perceived equity? We predicted that perceived equity would be significantly related to evaluations and that "loss" would result in lower ratings while "profit" would result in higher ratings.

Procedure

Communication Arts and Sciences 241, "Introduction to Public Speaking," is a basic curriculum requirement for graduation from the University. This multi-section public speaking course is taught by several instructors and enrolls more than 400 students each quarter. Available data from the Registrar's files and from student self-reports provide a variety of factual and attitudinal indices for each student enrolled in the course. A multiple-item course evaluation instrument was administered each quarter. Data from this instrument were analyzed for this study. This prodecure sacrifices some precision since the test instruments were not specifically designed to measure equity and its effects. But such a precedure did not seem inappropriate since our objective was an initial and preliminary evaluation of Sussman's basic position.

For this research we selected the data from three quarters of the 1974-75 academic year: Fall ($n = 416$), Winter ($n = 502$), Spring ($n = 470$). The three sets of data are independently analyzed as simultaneous replications of the same inquiry.

We analyzed the data in three stages: 1) development of operational definitions for the concepts of instructor and course evaluation; 2) development of operational definitions for perceived equity; and 3) examination of the data statistically to test the hypothesis.

The previously collected data included a large number of both objective and attitudinal responses. For development of course evaluation measures we excluded from analysis all objective indices (gpa, ACT scores, etc.) and all attitudinal items which seemed related to the equity concept. This left a total of 36 five-alternative, multiple-choice items all of which were evaluations of the course or instructor collected at the end of the quarter. These items were factor analyzed using principle factoring with iteration and varimax rotation.5 The initial analysis was restricted to factors with eigenvalues in excess of 1.0, which provided six-, five-, and five-factor solutions accounting for 67, 63, and 66 percent of the total variance for Fall, Winter, and Spring respectively. Factors were retained, however, only if at least two variables loaded on that factor in exess of .60 with no secondary loadings as high as .40. Results are summarized in Table 1. Two factors emerged from the Fall data; in the Winter and Spring, however, a third factor also emerged.6 Inspection indicated a high level of consistency from quarter to quarter in factor composition.

We interpreted the first factor as measuring perceived *Interpersonal Competence* of the instructor. This factor had consistently high loadings from questionnaire items concerned with the interpersonal skills of the instructor. The highest loadings were for ratings of such items as the instructor's rapport with students (.83, .86, .81), friendliness (.81, .84, .79), sense of humor (.78, .74, .77), sensitivity and

responsiveness to students (.81, .81, .77), respect for students (.78, .77, .76), and interest in student comments (.79, .77, .75). We labeled the second factor *Course Value*. Items with high loadings on this factor dealt with the utility of course content. The highest loadings were for overall value of the course (.80, .82, .81), satisfaction with the overall course (.75, .80, .78), and the vocational value of the speaking skills learned (.69, .74, .76). The third factor, which emerged only in Winter and Spring, we labeled *Technical Competence*. This factor had high loadings for questionnaire items concerned with the technical skills of the instructor: organization in class procedure (.69, .67) and management of class time (.67, .64).

For each student three factor scores are created by summing across those scales which loaded every quarter on the factor and dividing by the number of such scales. The three resulting cores were taken as measures of instructor and course evaluation. The two instructor evaluation factors are similar to some factors (Rapport and Structure) noted in previous studies.7 The thirty-six items from which the three factors were derived almost certainly,however, do not exhaust the universe of either instructor or course evaluation.

The second stage in the data analysis was the determination of operational definitions for perceived equity. From objective data and from student self reports not included in the course and instructor evaluation measures we identified five measures and derived two additional scores for a total of seven indices of perceived equity.

Two of the attitudinal items which we selected as measures of equity asked for reports concerning the appropriateness of Input. On five-item scales students were asked to evaluate the difficulty of the course (from "much too difficult"to "much too easy") and "in comparison to other college courses on this level" the amount of preparation time required (from " much more time" to "much less time"). We believe these items reflect perceptions of whether or not the amount of Input required was equitable. The first item was labeled *effort input*; the second, *time input*. Reports that the course required "much more time" or was " much too difficult" were taken as an indication of a perceived "loss." Reports that the course required "much less time" or was "much too easy" were taken as indicative of a perceived "profit."

Another survey item taken as a report of perceived equity was an item requiring the student to rate himself as a public speaker at the end of the quarter ("among the best" to "among the worst"). We labeled this item *skills outcome* because it seemed to solicit reports of whether or not a student's skills outcome was equitable in comparison to other students in his section. This item specified the comparison Other (other students in the same section). A report of very high personal skills was taken as indicative of a "profit"; a report of low skills, as a "loss."

A fourth item consisted of responses to the question "were the three

tests a fair and accurate measure of the conceptual knowledge you have gained from the book and the lectures?" We believe this question asked the student to report his perception of Input (study) versus Outcome (test score) for the corse exams. Answers were collected on a five-item scale (Yes!, yes, uncertain, no,No!). This measure was somewhat deficient in that a "no" answer might reflect either a "loss;; or a "profit." But in our experience the perception of a testing procedure as inequitably profitable is rare. We retained the item because it was our only index of test equity. We designated it *test fairness*. A "yes" answer was taken as perceived "porfit"; a "no" answer, as perceived "loss."

The fifth and last self-report to be used without change was rating of the instructor's impartiality in grading. Answers seemed to reflect whether or not the student perceived the instructor as treating him or her as well as Others in rewarding Inputs with appropriate Outcomes. This scale is designated *evaluation fairness*. A report of partiality was assumed to reflect a perceived "loss."

Two additional measures of perceived equity were derived. One such measure was derived from answers to two questions concerning grades. Students were asked to indicate the grade "you feel that you should receive for the work you have done in this course" and also the grade "you feel that you will actually receive." Responses to each question had a potential range from A(4) to F(0). We subtracted the expected grade from the deserved grade to derive a measure of discrepancy between derserved and anticipated Outcomes. We designated this index *quarter grade discrepancy*. One who expected a higher grade than deserved was taken as experiencing a "profit"; one who expected a lower grade, a "loss." It should be noted that this item was based on anticipated (expected) grades rather than the grades actually received. This procedure seemed appropriate since we sought to measure the perceived inequity at the time of course evaluation—actual final grades had not yet been determined.

Another measure of perceived equity was derived by subtracting each student's perceived anticipated grade from his or her actual cumulative grade point average. We felt that a student might use cumulative gpa as a baseline indication of the sort of Outcome (grade) which was appropriate to his or her Input (efforts). This measure was designated *career grade discrepancy*. It was assumed that surpassing one's gpa might be experienced as a "profit" while making a lower grade might be experienced as a "loss."

Thus, a total of seven equity measures were available. In some instances (e.g. *quarter grade discrepancy, evaluation fairness*) these measures seemed to directly tap perceived equity; in other instances (e.g. *career grade discrepancy*) the measures indicated only that conditions existed which might trigger perceptions of inequity. While these measures did not exhaust the possibilities suggested by

Sussman's work, they seemed to provide initial approximations of indices for several aspects of perceived inequity.

Finally, we evaluated the hypothesis. With two measures of course and instructor evaluation for Fall and three for Winter and Spring, and seven measures of perceived equity for each quarter, there were 14 tests of the hypothesis in the Fall and 21 in each of the other quarters. A Pearson correlation with pairwise deletion of data was used to test the relationships.8 Alpha level was set at .05 for each *set* of data; the alpha level per *test* of hypothesis was, then, .0027 for Fall (.05/18= .0027)9 and .0018 for Winter and Spring (.05/27= .0018).9 Results are reported in Table 2.

In the Fall 12 out of 14 relationships were statistically significant; in the Winter 11 out of 21; and in the Spring, 12 out of 21. Out of a total of 56 correlations 35 were statistically significant. All significant correlations were in the predicted direction.

Ten of the hypothesized relationships were confirmed in every quarter tested: with *effort input, evaluation fairness, quarter grade discrepancy, and career grade discrepancy*; ratings of Course Value were significantly correlated with *effort input, test fairness, evaluation fairness, quarter grade discrepancy,* and *career grade discrepancy*; and Technical Competence was significantly related to *evaluation fairness.*

These results provide initial empirical support for Sussman's analysis. Our results suggest that perceived equity may be consistently and significantly related to evaluations of course and instructor. In ten cases the relationship was confirmed each time it was tested; in one instance (Interpersonal Competence and *evaluation fairness*) the correlation was never lower than.68. *Quarter grade discrepancy*, the measure which most closely approximated Sussman's conception of classroom Outcome equity, was significantly related to evaluations in six out of eight tests. 10

Results also suggest that Technical Competence, the least stable of the three evaluation factors, may be less sensitive to perceived equity than the other factors. It was significantly related to an index of perceived equity in only four out of fourteen cases. Course Value may be most sensitive; correlations were significant in 17 out of 21 tests.

These results should be treated as exploratory, however, for the following reasons. First, since perceived equity was measured rather than manipulated one cannot be certain whether perceived inequity affected evaluations or the other way round. Second, since the data were gathered as a part of an in-place course evaluation several measures of perceived equity are approximate at best. In future research it should be possible to correct both problems.

The present results do, however, suggest the potential explanatory power of equity theory in the classroom and, therefore, indicate the need for additional research.

The implications of equity theory for the classroom teacher are

several. First, evaluations of course and instructor are rendered partially suspect. Such evaluations may reflect, at least partially, a teacher's skill at inducing perceived equity rather than his or her subject matter teaching skills. Researchers attempting to measure subject matter teaching skills should be aware of such contamination. A teacher may, for example, receive low ratings not because he or she is doing a bad job but because other teachers offer a more favorable "exchange rate" (i.e. higher grades for same or less work). Teachers have frequently believed this could occur. Sussman's analysis and our data appear consistent with such a belief.

Second, teachers might improve their chances for a fair evaluation by attempting to make students aware of all actual Outcomes (knowledge, skills, techniques) from a course by attempting to identify appropriate Others. The identification of appropriate Others should probably begin in the course orientation. Students should be made aware as much as possible of the type of course and approach of the instructor. This should assist the student in selecting an appropriate Other for comparison. Awareness of Outcomes and selection of appropriate Others should, in turn, prepare the student to more carefully assess the value of a course. It would appear, for example, that the teacher who teaches well but does not induce a self-conscious student awareness of increased knowledge or skills may be unfairly perceived as a poor teacher. This may explain the anecdotal evidence of teachers who are regarded as too demanding by their current students but deeply appreciated by former students (who subsequently discovered previously unrecognized Outcomes).

Third, a teacher might induce increased effort (Input) from students by inducing perceived "profit" early in an academic term. This could be done by altering perceived Outcome or perceived comparison Other. In our experience teachers frequently seek to produce increased effort by inducing "loss" (by grading an early exam especially hard, for example). Such a procedure may be less effective than the "profit" alternative.

In fact there may be a variety of specific applications of equity theory to classroom communication. Our reserch does, we think, indicate the potential value of equity theory in the classroom. More research, both theoretical and applied seems desirable.

Table 1
Factor Analysis: Evaluation of Course and Instructor

Questionnaire Items	Fall		Winter			Spring		
	IC	CV	IC	CV	TC	IC	CV	TC
Take instructor for another course*	686	365	602	299	346	609	351	358
Compared to others as a teacher	698	348	599	228	441	532	281	505
Feel free to ask questions	636	324	631	175	200	571	228	249
Popularity of instructor*	748	189	744	173	245	623	146	282
Clarity of assignments	619	367	514	173	487	457	212	504
Value of criticism (of speeches)	637	363	607	164	403	475	263	521
Interest in helping students*	769	234	793	161	238	716	197	290
Availability for individual help	569	192	613	071	201	558	173	274
Overall effectiveness as a teacher	807	330	699	227	526	681	225	546
Interest in student comments*	790	259	774	192	240	753	128	547
Sense of humor*	782	164	737	031	279	773	061	250
Friendliness*	813	192	838	084	198	786	112	245
Rapport with students*	827	207	856	083	212	810	155	288
Helpfulness*	758	208	736	189	230	724	185	256
Sensitivity and responsiveness*	810	194	806	213	192	768	144	265
Flexibility*	767	106	680	123	245	669	121	516
Use of examples and illustrations	674	283	555	175	472	489	095	546
Stimulates your thinking	744	361	623	257	430	597	219	525
Instructor communicates well in class	767	289	599	180	548	598	106	572
Respect for students*	776	247	769	130	268	761	132	316
Recommend friend take your instructor*	673	190	640	157	229	619	223	364
Overall value of the course*	283	803	194	819	075	103	814	271
Skills gained useful in vocation*	274	688	146	741	143	051	756	195
Course a satisfying experience*	274	754	160	795	079	142	781	257
Should course be required*	104	655	160	658	085	070	693	149
If not required, would take course*	351	646	142	674	148	238	668	169
Knowledge of subject	529	265	441	098	557	339	070	662
Organization in class procedure*	502	341	393	166	693	340	108	672
Management of class time*	377	293	360	175	677	325	151	645

*Variables which loaded on a factor every quarter. Variables have been deleted which did not load acceptably on a factor at least one quarter.

Table 2

Pearson Correlations: Perceived Equity and Evaluations of Course and Instructor

Equity Index	quarter	Evaluations		
		Interpersonal Competence	Course Value	Technical Competence
Effort Input	F	38*	37*	
	W	18*	26*	-02
	S	24*	25*	11
Time Input	F	30*	12	
	W	05	11	-02
	S	13	08	04
Skill Outcome	F	14	21*	
	W	-01	10	05
	S	07	28*	01
Test Fairness	F	25*	38*	
	W	15	40*	11
	S	10	30*	17*
Evaluation Fairness	F	68*	36*	
	W	71*	28*	53*
	S	71*	35*	18*
Quarter Grade Discrepancy	F	27*	23*	
	W	23*	14*	11
	S	17*	16*	15
Career Grade Discrepancy	F	38*	33*	
	W	28*	26*	21*
	S	26*	38*	11

*p. = .001, one-tailed test. A positive value (+) indicates the relationship was in the expected direction.

Notes

1. The following soucres provide an introduction to several of the more important issues: Rebecca Bryson, "Teacher Evaluations and Student Learning: A Reexamination," *Journal of Educational Research*, 68 (1974), 12-14; James A. Kulik, and Wilbert J. McKeachie, "The Evaluation of Teachers in Higher Education," in *Review of Research in Education*, vol. 3, ed. Fred N. Kerlinger (Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1975), pp. 210-240; Allan C. Ornstein, "Evaluating Teachers and School Administrators: The Politics of Accountability," *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 8 (1975), 73-81; Earl E. McDowell, "The Semantic Differential as a Mehtod of Teacher Evaluation," *Journal of Educational Research*, 68 (1975), 330-332; W.J. McKeachie, and Yi-Guang Lin, "Multiple Discriminant Analysis of Student Ratings of College Teachers," *Journal of Educational Research*, 68 (1975), 300-305.

2. LyleSussman, "A Theoretical Analysis of Equity and Its Relationship to Student Evaluation," *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 40, (1975), 333.

3. Sussman, 332.

4. J.S. Adams. amd W.B. Rosenbaum, "The Relationship of Worker Productivity to Cognitive Dissonance about Wage Inequities," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46 (1962), 161-164.

5. Jae-On Kim, "Factor Analysis," in Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karen Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Bent, *SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*, Second Ed., (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), pp. 468-514.

6. We discuss the factors in this sequence for convience; but in the Winter and Spring data Technical Competence actually emerged second and Course Value third.

7. Kulik and McKeachie, p. 213.

8. Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 280-288.

9. We initially tested nine indices of perceived equity but eliminated two as duplicative. In order to control for capitalization upon chance we derived the hypothesis-wise alpha level on the basis of nine equity measures instead of the seven actually retained.

10. Sussman, p. 327.

COMBATING STRESS AND TENSION THROUGH THE USE OF RELAXATION EXERCISES IN THE SPEECH COMMUNICATION CLASSROOM

Teresa G. Elliott, Ph.D.
and
George S. Everly, Jr., Ph.D.
University of Maryland

The incidence of stress has reached alarming proportions in American society today and the process of speech communicatin is responsible for much of the stress inherent in academe.

Since employing neuromuscular relaxation [NR] as a relaxation strategy has already been proven as a remedy for generalized stress and anxiety of all types, this paper describes a technique found effective in inducing a state of relaxation in speech communication students and urges the inclusion of [NR] in the speech communication curriculum.

In present day American society, the incidence of stress has reached alarming proprtions. The American Psychiatric Association has formally recognized the possibility of stress and aniexty playing a major role in the etiology of physical, as well as mental, disease.1 One need not be a member of what has been traditionally thought of as the high-risk professions to suffer from stress. Stress and anxiety pervade *every* aspect of American life. Perhaps the greatest commentary on the stressful American life style is the fact that once again in 1977, the anti-anxiety drugs were the most frequently taken prescription drug in this country. Many health professionals are proclaiming stress and anxiety have even infiltrated the hallowed halls of academe. The process of speech communication is blantantly responsible for a great deal of the stress inherent in academe. Most implicated, of course, is formal public speaking. However, group discussion, briefing, voice and diction, interviewing- indeed all performance courses-seem to be implicated as powerful stressors.

After reviewing numerous studies on speaking, Selye concludes that speaking to a group may create massive psychophlsiological stress reactions in the body.2 The most prominant constituent of this reaction is the neuro-chemical discharge that temporarily destroys the

homeostatic integrity of the automatic nervous system. We, as communication educators, should make consicious provisions to prevent or at least minimize the severity of such disstressful reactions.

Employing neuromuscular relaxation (NR) as a relaxation strategy for general rather than specific forms of communication anxiety has yet to gain the widespread usage it deserves. This, depite the plethora of literature proving the efficacy of the process as a remedy for generalized stress and axiety of all types. Jacobson pioneered in finding successes with NR in numerous diversified areas of stress treatment.3 Wolpe and Lazarus used NR as a "warm-up" in preparation for counseling sessions and as a integral part of systematic desensitization therapy of phobias.4 Paul reported that NR was superior to hypnosis in reducing stress.5 Further research by Paul and Trimble found that NR was extremely effective in actually reducing neuro-humoral manifestations of stress as well as subjective reports of stress.6 Finally, research by Husek and Alexander demonstrated that NR was superior to hypnosis as a method for reducing stress arrousal in the cardiovascular and pulmonary autonomic mechanisms. Similarly, tht NR was capable of reducing "test anxiety" in students.7

This paper descibes a technique found effective in inducing a state of relaxation in speech communication students. This procedure which combines the process of neuromuscular relaxation with guided imagery is a modification of a method developed by Everly at the University of Maryland Psychophysiological and Biofeedback Laboratory.8 The technique has been demonstrated to produced a psychophysiological state of relaxation in college students as measured by electroencephalographic and electromyographic methodologies. Progressive neuromuscular relaxation has been found effective when a constitutent of systematic desensitization for public speaking apprehension.9 However, few communication educators use it as an independent relaxation technique unto itself.

While recent reports of communication apprehension state that very "little can be done to cure communication apprehension in the regular classroom,"10 it is possible to utilize the classroom to introduce the student to the technique of deep relaxation. However, before the exercise begins, it is important for the students to realize that this technique is being introduced to them to take home and use as needed. The classroom is a rather strang place to learn to relax and perhaps they won't experience deep relaxation--especially the first time they try. But if they use the technique at home, in a comfortable, quiet place, they will improve their skill. They can also tape record their own instructions and play them back. Practice is the most important aspect of learning to relax.

Using the regular classroom is somewhat limiting and it is well to try

to arrange for a special room, free of desks with a rug on the floor so that those who wish can lie flat. If this is impossible, encourage the students to assume a position in which all aspects of the body are supported. Both feet should be flat on the floor if the student is sitting upright in a chair. Caution them to refrain from any muscle "strain." Do each exercise twice with 3 second tension and have them become increasingly aware of the tension-relaxation differences for each muscle group. Tight clothing should be loosened and glasses and shoes removed if desired. Also, dim the lights if possible.

First, have them stretch, breathe deeply and exhale to make them more comfortable and reduce self consiousness. Since the facial area seems to be the most difficult to relax, start by saying:

Now open your eyes--look up--look down--look to the right--look to the leff--look straight ahead--close your eyes. Now open your month--stick out your tongue--curl the tongue back to the roof of your month--uncurl your tongue--close your month. Now open your eyes....

Repeat this a number of times until the students seem quiet and begin to relax. Then continue:

Slowly breathe in deeply and breathe out deeply, 3-5 time, then just let your muscles go a little more and relax more deeply. [Allow whatever time is needed, around 40-60 seconds.] Taking about six seconds to do so, let's breathe in slowly and very deeply... Let's exhale as slowly and very deeply....With your lungs empty try to blow out an imaginary candle a foot in front of your face--that's how deeply you should exhale.... Let's go on inhaling and exhaling as deeply as you can, very slowly, six seconds or longer each way.

By this time, the students should be tuned in to their breathig process and turned out of the classroom environment. Next, begin to make them aware of different muscle groups--a tension-relaxation technique. Ask them to:

Concentrate on your right leg... tighten your right calf by pretending to raise up your toes... tight, tight, now relax. Now point your toes up, keeping your heels on the floor... tight, tight, now relax. Once again, tighten your cald muscle by pretending to rise up your toes... tight, tight, now relax. Now dig you heels on the floor and point your toes... tight, tight, and relax... Now moving up to your right thigh--extend and straighten your right leg... tight, tight, and relax. Now once again. [Repeat the tension-relaxtion technique on the right thigh]. Your whole leg is completely relaxed. Does it feel heavy, a dead weight? Or does it begin to feel light? Is it beginning to float?

Then repeat the process on the left leg, concentrating on the calf muscles and thighs, doing each exercise twice with 3 second tension. Now go back to the deep breathing process.

Inhale now and exhale deeply, slowly... In inhaling, let's help the process along by imagining you have a nose in you feet. Imagine having a nostril in the bottom of each foot, between mid-arch and the sole of each foot... Imagine as you breathe in deeply that you are pulling in air up through you feet... Feel each breathe coming up through you legs and body. Breathe out through your normal nose or if you prefer, your month.

Then continue the tension-relaxation technique by having the students concentrate on the abdominal area by flattening and tightening their stomach muscles and then relaxing. Do this twice. Moving on to the right hand have them extend and spread their fingers and then relax. Next clench their fist and curl their wrist inward. Then relax. Repeat the process and then move on to the left hand. Next the arms (one at a time) by flexing the biceps and pressing the arms-elbows back into the back of the chair or floor. Tense and relax the shoulders by shrugging them. Lastly, the face by clenching the teeth, pressing tongue against roof of the month smiling, tightly clenching the eyes closed, frowning with forhead and elevating the forehead. Each of these exercises being done twice with relaxation in between. Then go back to the breathing process instructing them to breathe deeply.

Feel as if each breath coming in through your feet and pulling up through your legs and body, is swirling up through the tensions, toxins, and tiredness and other noise that had been cluttering the swirling up and carrying away all that unwanted stuff. Feel your breath exhaled breath carrying that noise out of your body, carrying away anything that doesn't belong... Once such noise is out of your body and into the light and air, it just becomes good clean life energy which you or anyone else can later tap and put to good use. As you pull noise up from your body and push it out with your exhaled breath, you are not only cleaning up your system but doing a good thing by creating a lot of new life energy.

While the students are breathing deeply and becoming more and more relaxed, offer them a "bonus" or "instant vacation." This is done by having tem visualize an elevator--doors open--everyone who wishes steps in... the doors close... and everyone looks up at the evelator indicator. We are on the 10th floor an d when we reach the first floor we will all visualize our favorite place of relaxation. Maybe at the

beach, in the woods, at home in our bed-but a beautiful place where we will visit for a little while. Tell them if they wish to leave before anyone else they simply count up from one to ten and come back into the classroom. Then start the countdown and describe a beach scene--asking them to look to the right, left, behind, and up, down, feel, touch, smell, visualize the scene. After describing, let them create their own vacation.

After about five minutes, warn them that it will be time to leave shortly. Then tell them to bid farewell to the scene and get back into the elevator. Coaxing them and even mentioning a few names of students helps to get them back into the elevator:

Visualize the number 1 on the elevator indicator. Coming up slowly now number two, three, four... when we reach the number 10 you will feell better than before, you will feel as if you had one hour of perfect sleep, no headache, no discomfort,... five, 6, 7, starting to stretch now, 8, coming up, 9, and ten! FEELING TERRIFICALLY GOOD!

At this point, turn on the light and walk around. It is important to let them sit for a monent and regain perceptual and physiological orientation. By relaxing, the students have created a state of hydrostatic hypotension which will result in lightheadedness if they immediately stand up. After the students have opened their eyes and allowed their body and mind to orient themselves for several moments, have them slowly stand up. Try to talk to the students to get feedback on their experience. An amazing number seem to really relax and visualize the first time they try the exercise. All of them enjoy the experience and speak later about using the technique at home. Some use it when they are extremely tired and don't have time to take a long rest. Others use deep relaxation when they are very tense and need to unwind before a speech, exam, or when they face a difficult situation. They uses are endless.

The positive reaction from students is overwhelming. Perhaps, "the best class I've ever had" or "the most useful thing I've learned during college", are exaggerations. But the general feeling is that the class time spent on learning NR is time well sent and an unusually rewarding experience. We as speech educators should not delay in helping a alleviate some of the stress and anxiety produced by our own discipline and our contempory demanding society. We should begin now to use the speech communication classroom to introduce our students to the technique of deep relaxation.

REFERENCES

1. American Psychiatric Association. DSM III. Washington, D.C. 1977.

2. H. Selye, *Stress in Health and Disease* (New York: Butterworths Press, 1976).

3. E Jacobson,*Progressive Relaxation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938).

4. J. Wolpe and A. Lazarus, *Behavior Therapy Techniques* (Oxford; Pergamon Press, 1966).

5. G.Paul, "Physiological Effects of Relaxation Training and Hypnotic Suggestion," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 74 (1969), 425-437.

6. G. Paul and R. Trimble, "Record versus Life Relaxation Training and Hypnotic Suggestion: Comparative Effectiveness for Reducing Physiological Arousal and Inhibiting Stress Response," *Behavior Therapy*, 1 (1970), 285-302.

7. T. Husek and S. Alexander, "The Effectiveness of the Anixety Differential in Examination Situations," *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 23 (1963), 309-318.

8. G. S. Everly, "Neuromuscular Relaxation in Combination With Guided Imagery: Electrophysiological Correlates," Unpublished Research Report, Psychophysiology and Biofeedback Research Laboratiry, University of Maryland, College Park, 1977.

9. J. McCroskey, D. Ralph and J. Barrick, "The Effect of Systematic Desensitization on Speech Anxiety," *Speech Teacher* 19 (1970), 32-36.

10. J. McCroskey, "Classroom Consequences of Communication Apprehension," *Communication Education* 26 (1977), p. 33.

LANGUAGE SOCIALIZATION IN THE CLASSROOM

David R. Woods, Ph.D. and Richard Wright, Ph.D.

Howard University

I. Introduction

The field of sociolinguistics has contributed greatly to our understanding of language and its role in the communication process. Sociolinguistics takes as fundamental the notion that language is a variable and highy adaptable tool which speakers manipulate in the context of social interaction. That is, the domain of sociolinguistic research has been and continues to be the study of language in its *social context*.Theorists (e.g. Hymes, 1967; Labov, 1966; Garfinkel, 1967; Searle, 1969) cautioned against adopting idealized accounts of language structure as descriptions of actual communcation and have argued for the need to find ways to understand the *social functions* of particular forms of language as used in specific social situations. These argument have been taken seriously and, as a result, sociolinquists have learned how it is said, by whom to whom, where, when, and for what purposes.

When asked or pressed to describe the function of language in human affairs, both lay and academically trained persons tend to respond that"people use language to express or communicate their thoughts and ideas."Implicit in such a statement is the recognition that language is a social tool to be used in the situation to communicate with someone else. As early as 1927, De Laguna (republished, 1963) criticized this long-standing view of thought transmission from person to person as the basic function to language. While accepting the general importance of the communication of thoughts and ideas, De Laguna proposed a different perspective which located the pivotal function of language within a more dynamic sociological framework:

Once we deliberately ask the question: what does speech do? What objective function does it perform in human life? The answer is not far to seek. Speech is the greatest medium through which human cooperation in brought about. It is the means by which the diverse

activities of men are coordinated and correlated with each other for the attainment of common and reciprocal ends. Men do not speak simply to relieve their feelings or to air their views, but to awaken a response in their fellows and to influence their attitudes and acts. It is further the means by which men are brought into a new and momentous relationship with the external world. The very relationship which makes the world for them an objective order[pp. 19-20].

The primacy of language function within the context of social interaction has been supported by numerous researchers since De Laguna (e.g. Bernarein, 1975; Bruner, 1974,1975; Ryan, 1974; Dore, 1975; Halliday, 1975; Bates, 1976). Most of this research has been conducted in relationship the language acquisition process in young children. That is, rather than a concern with sequential learning of grammatical forms and structures, these researchers have focussed on what the developing child is able to say (both semantically and syntactically) as well as the motivation for saying what is said. Following the perspective argued in Miller and 'Yoder (1972), in order for a child to use language, the child must not only have something to say and a way to say it, but also a reason to say it. It is only recently that this perspective of language as a means to achieving social and communicative functions has been applied to the study of language learning and language use in young children. However, the current trend is in this direction and those works cited above have contributed greatly to our understanding of the role which social interactions (especially with adults) play in language learning and in the developmental socialization of the child. This growing field of language research has come to be known as"pragmatics".

The present paper seeks to develop the concept that the classroom, like the home, is a context within which language functions as a crucial agent in the socialization of the child. Broadly conceived, socialization refers to the patterned and recurring experiences made available to the developing child and through which the child acquires the necessary values, orientation, and skills which allow the child to function in a manner acceptable to the community.Language socialization refers specifically to the role that language plays in the socialization of the child into a community or into the social world. As such,language can and, indeed, should be studied to discover its role in transforming the biologically endowed child into a specificcultural, socialized being.

II. Language Socialization of the Child in the home

Most normal children spend their early years of life within the context of a community which has an associated culture and life style.

The child undergoes experiences of being talked to, listened to, played with, disciplined, nourished, potty-trained,as well as a host of other routine and recurring activities which characterize what it means to grow up as a family (and, by extension community) member. In each of these recurring activities, language is addressed to the child who is either encouraged or discourged in the use of language in return. How adults use language in addressing the child,as well as the verbal exchange mode reinforced in the child jointly operate to guide the child's selective attention to the world around him. That is, language and comunication between adults and childern operate in such away that the child selectively attends to featues of the world that form part of the implicit values and cultural norms of the community.

Bernstein (e.g.1972) has emphasized the often observed fact that the way language is used in the home community orients the child toward certain preferred modes of language use. For example, in many lower-income families, language use is heavily context-bound, repetitive, restricted in vocabulary range, and syntactically less complex. Such language seems to function so as to emphasize and reinforce in the child his role as a member of the family. Such language is reassuring in that its highly predictable, familiar, and recurring patterns have high affective values for the growing child. Given the insecurities of lower-income life, language of this sort responds to the basic need to communicate to the child a strong sense of idenity to his family and immediate community. This is especially true if the community occupies a minority status and recognizes a language tradition marked by non-standard patterns of usage. That is, the interaction of minority status and a nonstandard language tradition tend to correlate with language socialization patterns which emphasize group identity and group solidarity. As important as such values are in human development, they do not prepare the child for the formal aspects of language for learning encountered in the everyday classroom. That is, classroom language emphasizes use and meanings somewhat removed from the child's cultural and language experiences. from a continum perspective, there is an abrupt discontinuity between the language routines of the home and the language demands of the classroom.

Such is not the case for many children of middle-income backgrounds. Since most middle-income parents are educated through high school and beyond,they have the ability to provide their children with a wider range of experiences with language that includes books and reading, sustaining conversation and dialogue, encouraging question-answer exchanges, corrective feedback in language form and use, as well as a host of other language-related experiences which function to prepare the child for the formal *learning through language* that characterizes the classroom.

III. Language and the Classroom

The urban school, unlike its suburban neighbor, often brings together in the same classroom childern of diverse social, ethinic, and linguistic background. The experiences and interpersonal exchanges of the home have socialized each child into a particular set of behaviors which determine his perception of and inital responses to the teacher, peers, and physical surrounding of the classroom. The proper stance of the teacher in such a diverse situation is the recognize these differential socialization processes and to accept this diversity as a challenge. That is, the teacher must come to conceptualize the diverse classroom as an opportunity rather than an obstacle. As such, the role of the school is not to oppose or eradicate the results of the child's early socialization, but rather to introduce and elaborate a set of communicative behaviors and language skills which the child will need in order to function successfully in the wider community-at-large.

language has traditionally recieved much attention in the school curriculum. 'Proper' usage, 'correct' grammar, and good spelling have been stressed and the current failure of the schools to instill such skills in childern is much bemoaned. However, the present authors contend that this view of language is too narrow. It removes language from its normal and spontaneous contexts and makes it an artificial system, removed from reality. Language is not just a formal structure of rules and correctness. Language is the means for probing and exploring the universe. It is the medium through which one contacts other minds in order to gather information, test ideas, and communicate one's own knowledge. In short, language is the basic tool for learning. Successful use of language in the community-at-large does not result from acquisition of standard structures alone, but rather is the result of putting language to work in service to the individual. As suggested earlier, many parents make available to the child extensive socialization in such skills. He is encouraged to talk openly about his activities and to ask questions about what he does not understand. His persistent 'why?' questions are taken seriously rather than being impatiently dismissed. In other homes, the predominant functions of language may be quite different. The child may become very skilled in the use of language to establish successful interpersonal relations but may receive very little language experience for the formal aspects of learning and development.

The teacher in the urban, culturally diverse classroom confronts a range of language varieties (dialects) and language skills. Because schools have traditionally focussed on language structure, it was natural for the schools to try to apply second-language learning techniques to the problem of teaching standard language to non-standard speakers. Curricula were developed which used structured

pattern practice in standard english.This attempt has failed. Pattern practice is inherently boring and, divorced from its natural, social functions, the acquisition of a standard under such circumstances struck most students as empty and devoid of value.

Our contention is that the acquisition of standard language must be embedded in a curriculum whose primary objective is the acquisition of the communicative skills required for successful survival in the community. Support for this approach comes from both first and second language acquisition.It is commonplace that the child learns his mother tongue effortlessly simply by exposure to it in the natural communicative environment of his home community.The child's motivation to learn is high because language serves many functions he wants to perform. The acquisition of a second language is an instructive example if one looks, not at the usual foreign language classroom with its emphasis on structure,but rather at the child who is suddenly immersed in a foreign language after he has already acquired his mother tongue. This child is immediately confronted with a communications crisis. He lacks the means to perform the normal communicative functions that have been served by his first language. Typically, his motivation to acquire the second language is very high and aquisition of the appropriate structures takes place rapidly.

A number of advantages are inherent in a language curriculum which stresses acquisition of communicative skills over that of language structure. Since all childern need practice in thelanguage skills of the community-at-large —even those who have had greater practice in them at home, the nonstandard speaking child will not be singled out as much as he would in a structural approach. One of the damaging factors to such children's self-esteem has been the criticism of their nonstandard structrues. By immersing all the children in the variors roles which require new communicative skills,the teacher lets the standard structures and the new functions are properly seen as inseparably related. Since language learning in functional contexts is inherently motivating as is seen when children are totally immersed in a first or second language, we argue that this approach will be more successful than past structural approaches.

The approach to communicative development advocated here will require a detailed analysis of the components of social and informational communication in the community-at-large as well as the development of a language skill curriculum in which skills are ordered for each age level. Specific materials must then be developed which will involve the childern in the performance of various roles and their associated language skills.

Some of the following strategies might prove effective in training childern in the language skills of the community-at-large:

1. The Child as Information Source. The teacher might pose questions about a factural situation familiar to the child and help the child focus on objective features of the situation, organization and structuring the facts coherent presentation of knowledge rather than on the recitation of isolated facts.

2. The Child as Information Seeker. This is basically the reversal of the first situation. The child uses the teacher as information source. The teacher in the role of informant might vary the degree of cooperativeness on order to encourage the child to find the most exact and probing questions needed to elicit the desired information.

3. Group Role Playing. Various size groups of childern might be assigned roles to pay in well structured situations,e.g. a courtroom setting or a sports team strategy meeting. The childern's exposure to certain roles(e.g.judge, lawyer, defendant,or manager and player)and their conscious attempt to model the language specific behavior associated with these roles may enable the childern to activate passive knoweldge of some of these skills, and thereby, to learn by doing rather then by explicit instruction. If the role-play settings are chosen for their inherent interest, the childern's participation,and hence,practice of the desired skills should have productive,language-enhanceing results.

IV. Conclusion

Traditional approaches to language teaching have empasized structure. The present authors argue for the need to focus more upon developing in the child a sense of value for the significance and role of language in learning and personal growth. The position taken here is related to the argument that motivation and a perceived sense of value are stronger incentives for learning language skills than the avoidance of grammatical error. Effectiveness in language use is integrally related to career success in most fields of endeavor. Our school-age childern would do well to learn this fact early and to recieve extensive practice in developing effective language and communicative skills during the school experience.

Reference Bibliography

Bates,E. 1976. *Language and Context*. New York: Academic Press.

Bernstein, B. 1964. "Elaborated and restricted codes:Their social origins and some consequences." *American Anthropologist* 66(2):55-69.

Bernstein,B.,1972."Social class, Language, and Socialization. "In: P. Giglioli(ed.), *Language and social context*. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Bruner, J.1974."The organization of early skilled action." In: M. Richards(ed.),*The Integration of the Child into a Social World* London: Cambridge University Press.

Bruner,J.1975."The ontogenisis of speech acts."*Journal of Child Language* 2:1-19.

De Laguna, G. 1963.*Speech: Its Function and Development*. Bloomington, Indiana: University Press.(First published in 1927.)

Dore, J. 1975 "Holophrases, speech acts, and language universals." Journal of Child Language 2:21-40.

Garfinkel, H. 1976. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1975. *Learning How to Mean*. Amsterdam: Elsevier North-Holland.

Hymes,D.1967."The Function of Speech."In: J. DeCecco (ed.), *The Psychology of Language, Thought,and Instruction*.New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Labov, W.1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Miller, J. and D. Yoder. 1972."A syntax teaching program." In: J. McLean, D.Yoder, and R. Schiefelbusch (eds.), *Language Intervention with the Retarded*. Baltimore: Universiy Park Press.

Ryan, J. 1974. "Early Language Development: Towards a communicational analysis." In: Richards (ed.), *The Integration of the Child into a Social World*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. 1969. *Speech Acts*. London: Cambridge University Press.